



Notice of Meeting

Meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate

University of California

Please Preserve This Notice

To maintain a complete record of the proceedings of the Assembly, members of the Assembly are asked to preserve this copy of the Notice and append it to the Minutes.

Wednesday, November 28, 1973 at 10:00 a.m.
Lipman Room, Barrows Hall, Berkeley Campus
Luncheon Recess at Noon
[Vol. XI, No. 1]

— 1 —

Order of Business

	PAGE
I. A—Roll Call of Members	
B—Minutes of the Meeting of May 30, 1973	
II. Announcements by the President	
III. Other Announcements	
IV. Special Orders	
1. Annual Reports of Standing Committees, 1973-73	
A. Consent Calendar:	
1. Academic Council, Part A. S. E. Sperling, Chairman.	2
2. Budget and Interdivisional Relations. J. L. Hodges, Jr., Chairman	10
3. Editorial. C. A. Johnson, Co-Chairman.	10
4. Educational Policy. K. S. Pister, Chairman.	13
5. Graduate Affairs. F. Reines, Chairman.	17
B. Academic Council, Part B. S. E. Sperling, Chairman.	7
Amendments to Senate Legislation, Irvine	
2. Amendment to Santa Barbara Grading System. R. A. Cockrell, Secretary (North).	20

V. Reports of Special Committees

VI. Reports of Standing Committees

1. Academic Council. A. F. Kip, Chairman. . . . 21

2. Committees. M. E. Mathias, Chairman. . . . 23

3. Rules and Jurisdiction (Oral). D. S. Hobbs, Chairman

4. Davis Division. R. D. Cramer, Chairman. . . . 24

5. Irvine Division. K. Moldave, Chairman. . . . 25

6. San Francisco Division. M. Jones, Chairman. . . . 27

VII. Petitions of Students

VIII. Unfinished Business

IX. University and Faculty Welfare

X. New Business

A. Second Roll Call

[The Assembly may act finally on matters not included in the call for the meeting only by unanimous consent of the members present. (By-Law 166)]

ROBERT A. COCKRELL, *Secretary (North)*
 BRUCE H. HERRICK, *Secretary (South)*
 Assembly of the Academic Senate
 November 7, 1973

Schedule of Meetings of the Assembly of the Academic Senate, 1973-74

Wednesday, November 28, 1973 at 10:00 a.m., Lipman Room, Barrows Hall Berkeley Campus (October 24)¹

Wednesday, March 6, 1974 at 10:00 a.m., California Room, Faculty Center Los Angeles Campus (January 30)

Thursday, May 30, 1974 at 10:00 a.m., Lipman Room, Barrows Hall Berkeley Campus (April 25)

Report of the Academic Council, 1972-73

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

1. Final date on which the Secretaries can receive reports to be printed in the call for the meeting. Reports longer than three typewritten pages should reach the Secretaries at least two days before the specified deadline.

A. Annual Report

The 1972-73 Academic Council had barely begun to function before the first avalanche of work descended upon us. Although we often felt that we

— 3 —

could not possibly continue to juggle so many diverse demands upon our time and energies, somehow we did, and somehow we managed.

Singly, none of our activities was of world-shaking significance. But in the aggregate, their number and range are a convincing demonstration of the extent to which the Senate is becoming an increasingly active participant in the arenas within and outside the University where the decisions that affect us are made.

This is a relatively new trend in Senate affairs and one with which we still are not completely comfortable. Comfort notwithstanding, however, we are persuaded that the trend will continue. The responsible exercise of our delegated authority in University governance appears to require that we now play a more substantial, direct role in the affairs of the University and of the State than we have in the past, if only because the potential costs of non-participation now are becoming too high for us to continue to allow our hesitation to be interpreted as hauteur or our ignorance to be seen as indifference.

There are problems associated with the increased visibility of the Senate that still must be worked out, but our experience with the potentially serious problem of intra-Senate authorities and relationships leads us to believe that future difficulties, like this one, may turn out to be more apparent than real.

The structure of the Universitywide Senate makes it inevitable that the Chairman of the Assembly and the Council will bear the primary responsibility for expressing Senate opinions to extra-Senate agencies and that the Council will be the primary committee advising the Chairman. Neither the Council nor the Chairman, however, would have any opinions reliable enough to be worth transmitting unless the rest of the Senate was willing to cooperate with them and to advise them. Almost without exception, they have been willing.

We have been tremendously impressed by the amount and the quality of the cooperation that we have received from almost every committee and individual in the Senate to whom we have gone for assistance and advice. The close and cordial interactions in which we have been privileged participants have been the most rewarding part of our year's work, and convince us that our individual and Divisional identities and interests do not preclude, and can coexist peacefully with, joint efforts.

The extent of the Council's interactions with other agencies of the Senate, in part, is reflected in the fact that participating guests from other committees were present at all eleven of our meetings during 1972-73. Most of these meetings were held either at Berkeley or Los Angeles according to the schedule for the meeting of The Board of Regents, but the Council also managed to visit Irvine and San Francisco during the year.

Some of the activities of the Council already have been reported to you by the Chairman (Records of the Assembly, November 29, 1972; March 7, 1973; May 30, 1973) and will not be repeated here. The more complete account that follows is organized, as was our work, into three partially overlapping areas: 1) Within the Senate: 2) Within the University: 3) Within the State.

1. *Within the Senate.* The attempts of previous Councils to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Senate's operation continued during 1972-73, but we perhaps

— 4 —

were even less successful than our predecessors had been. We completed no other recommendations besides those already brought to the Assembly and have handed on to the 1973-74 Council consideration of changes in the By-Laws of several other committees. The Senate's continuing concern about By-Laws 112 and 188 also has been carried over to 1973-74, along with consideration of a

proposal from the 1971-72 Committee on University Extension to award grade point as well as unit credit for concurrent course enrollments by Extensions students if and when those students enroll in a University degree program.

The Council also seriously discussed an organizational problem of its own. With nine new members out of fourteen in 1972-73, two of whom did not join the Council until mid-year, and about the same number anticipated for 1973-74, there was concern about continuity and about the ability of new Councils to begin to function effectively fairly immediately, especially in advising the President. Incoming Council members for 1973-74, therefore, were invited to attend the May meeting of the Assembly and to participate in the last four Council meetings. Most of them attended at least one meeting, and several of them had begun to take an active part in ongoing activities by the end of the year.

A considerable amount of time this year was spent on the Extended University (see next section) and on admissions and admissions experiments. Many internal housekeeping matters also were brought to the Council by Divisions and other committees or were referred by the Council to other committees, and progress reports from special committees of the Council including the Special Committee on Contingency Planning (Record of the Assembly, May 30, 1973) and two special committees of the UCEP were received and discussed.

2. *Within the University.*

- a. The Administration. President Hitch and Vice President Taylor attended the ten regular meetings of the Council, and Vice President McCorkle attended nine of them. In addition to these regularly scheduled discussions, the Chairman of the Council and the Office of the President exchanged innumerable telephone calls and memoranda in a not always successful attempt to keep the Council informed and to provide it with adequate advance notice about matters of concern to the Senate. The activities of the Council, the Committee on Academic Freedom, UCBIR and the Committee on Privilege and Tenure prior to and following the distribution of the revised Section 52 of the Academic Personnel Manual were reported to you last year (Record of the Assembly, May 30, 1973).

The Senate's response to the APPRB's draft policy for the University's libraries was another major joint committee effort. A report was submitted by the Academic Council on behalf of the Senate after extensive consultation with the University Library Committee and several of the University Librarians, including the Chairman of the Library Council. The Assembly's Special Committee on Long Range Educational Objectives and Academic Planning, the CCGA, the UCEP, and most of the Divisions also participated actively in this discussion.

The Council also sought the advice of several standing or special committees in consulting with the Office of the President about:

— 5 —

- 1) The President's Statement on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline. Following the Assembly's agreement on May 30, 1973, to continue to cooperate in this discussion, the Council asked the Committee on Committees to appoint a committee charged with this responsibility. It is our understanding that discussions will resume during 1973-74.
- 2) The educational aspects of computers. In response to a request from the APPRB to the Council, a special committee of the Council was appointed in 1971-72 to study and report on this matter. The Special Committee, composed of Professors R. F. Walters (Davis), Chairman; A. M. Bork (Irvine); L. Knopoff (Los Angeles) and E. L. Scott

(Berkeley), gave its report to the Council at a special meeting in December. The report, and the Council's comments, were forwarded to the APPRB and referred to the CCGA, the UCEP and the Special Committee on Long Range Educational Objectives and Academic Planning for review.

- 3) The Extended University. Approvals of variances to Senate Regulations for pilot programs at Santa Barbara and at Irvine were reported to the Assembly on May 30, 1973. Other activities included a request to the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction for an interpretation of the Council's Guidelines for the Review of Pilot Programs in the Extended University and the subsequent wide distribution of the Guidelines and the interpretation.

At the request of Professor Karl Pister, Chairman of the Coordinating Committee on the Extended University and of the UCEP, and with the recommendation of its Special Committee on Reorganization, the Council abolished the CCEU and asked the UCEP to advise it on matters relating to the Extended University. It is hoped that this change will facilitate Senate review of pilot programs proposed by Divisions. The Council's Guidelines for the Review of Pilot Programs in the Extended University then were revised in consultation with the Office of the Vice President, Extended Academic and Public Service Programs. Following approval by the Council, the revised Guidelines were distributed to Division Chairmen and Chairpersons and to Chancellors.

The Office of the President discussed Extended University programs, plans and budgets with the Council frequently during the year, and Vice President Gardner provided a thorough review of the program at the June Council meeting.

A request from the Council that a more descriptive title than Extended University be given to this program was considered but rejected by the Office of the President.

At President Hitch's or at the Council's request, many other items of mutual concern appeared on the Council's agenda one or more times during the year. Among them were the University's 1973-74 budget and the budget hearings, salaries and fringe benefits, the activities of the APPRB, the report of an APPRB Task Force on Agricultural Sciences, affirmative action for academic personnel, libraries, graduate education in the University, the reports and recommendations of the Select Committee of the Coordinating Council on Higher Education and of the Legislature's Joint Committee on the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, faculty workload, the AAUP censure of UCLA, collective bargaining, the \$1 million for the improvement

— 6 —

of undergraduate teaching, the faculty reductions at Riverside and policies on sabbatical leaves and early retirement. In many instances, the advice of special committees or other standing committees was sought on these items.

- b. The Regents. The Council continued to invite members of The Board of Regents to join them for dinner and conversation (Record of the Assembly, November 29, 1972), and we believe that both groups have learned a lot about each other through these informal interactions. The Chairman and Vice Chairman attended the meetings of The Regents' committees and of The Board, including executive sessions. Several other Council members occasionally attended the regular sessions of the meetings. On behalf of the Council and in consultation with the appropriate Senate committees, the Chairman formally addressed The Regents about several topics including the proposed 1973-74 Regents' budget, libraries and the \$1 million

for the improvement of undergraduate teaching; the Vice Chairman spoke about undergraduate admissions. Many informal conversations between members of the Council who attended the meetings and members of The Board also occurred during the meetings.

As a result of the efforts of both groups, Senate and Regent relations probably are more cordial than they have been for some time. The cordiality, however, still is a bit fragile and awkward, and the extent to which it reflects a real understanding of and respect for each other's point of view is uncertain. A considerable amount of mutual effort in these directions, therefore, still appears to be necessary before it becomes very likely that the two groups could work through another sharp disagreement without the acrimony of the still very recent past.

- c. The Students. We are troubled and chagrined that our efforts to improve communications with groups within and outside the University were least successful with the students. Carrying on the arrangements made during 1971-72, a Special Committee of the Council met several times early in the year with representatives of the Student Body Presidents' Council and the Student Lobby. The students' interest in those meetings ceased rather abruptly, however, at about the time that they became convinced that we and they had very different opinions about a number of topics including the participation of students in the work of Universitywide Senate committees, the extent to which *ad hoc* review committees need student observers at their meetings to interpret teaching evaluation data for them, the relative emphasis given to teaching and research in recommendations for promotions and merit increases and how best to assist departments in their efforts to evaluate teaching. It seems very important to us that both our agreements and our disagreements with the student organizations are the subjects of continuing conversation between us. And we hope that succeeding Councils will be much more successful than we seem to have been in fostering and nurturing these interactions.

3. *Within the State.*

— 7 —

- a. The Legislature's Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. The Council invited Assemblyman John Vasconcellos, Chairman of the Joint Committee, and Mr. Patrick Callan, Committee Consultant, to meet with the Chairmen of several Senate Committees shortly after the Committee's draft report was made public. The Chairman presented testimony on behalf of the Council at two of the Joint Committee's hearings on the draft report.
- b. The 1973-74 University budget. Either the Chairman or the Vice Chairman was present at almost all of the meetings of the Senate Finance Committee and the Assembly Ways and Means Committee where the 1973-74 University budget was reviewed, and both of them took part in the hearings on the budget. They also joined the Chairperson of the Berkeley Division and some members of that Division in an initially successful but ultimately unsuccessful effort to keep the Senate's budget from being put in a separate appropriation for 1973-74.
- c. The Governor's office. Dr. Alex Sherriffs, Education Advisor to the Governor, and the Chairman had useful and candid discussions on matters of mutual concern fairly regularly throughout the year. Professor Paul Zinner and Professor Arthur Kip participated in some of the meetings. The Chairman and the Vice Chairman also talked intermittently with some of the staff people in the Department of Finance.
- d. Academic Senate of the California State University and Colleges. Two meetings of the Council's Special Committee on Liaison with the CSUC Academic Senate and some members of the CSUC Senate Executive Committee were held. In addition, the two Chairmen tried to keep each other informed on items that they judged to be of interest to the other Senate or of concern to both Senates.

In concluding this section of our report, we want especially to express our deep appreciation and gratitude to the staffs of the Berkeley and Los Angeles Senate Offices for their graciously given assistance in the work of the Universitywide Senate. Ms. Patricia Hatfield at Berkeley and Ms. Jeanne Hatteberg at Los Angeles deserve special mention for their heroic service to the Council, as does Ms. Jackie Watters at Riverside.

B. Amendments to Senate Legislation

On July 11, 1973, in accordance with the provisions of By-Law 80(B)(4) and after consultation with the UCEP and the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, the Academic Council gave provisional approval on behalf of the Assembly to a request from the Irvine Division to amend Regulation A410, Normal Progress Requirement, as follows:

Previous Wording

A410. *Normal Progress Requirement.* Students may become subject to probation or to academic disqualification by failure to make normal progress toward a degree. Normal progress toward a degree for full-time undergraduate students shall be measured by units completed.

(A) The following table defines progress on all levels:

Progress	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors
Lineal	45	90	135	180
Normal	36	80	128	180
Probationary	35-25	79-73	127-125	
Disqualified	24 or below	72 or below	124 or below	

- (B) Any full-time undergraduate student whose progress is below normal for two or more quarters shall be subject to dismissal.
- (C) A freshman who accumulates 8 units or less per quarter is subject to disqualification. Normal progress for all undergraduates is defined by the table in (A) above.
- (D) Students who wish to register for more than 20 units in a quarter must have the signature of their dean on an Excess Credit Petition showing good cause.
- (E) The Registrar shall scan transcripts to identify students who fall below normal levels. Students shall be placed on probation or will become subject to disqualification once each year, at the end of the Spring quarter.

Amend Wording Approved

A410. *Normal Progress Requirement.* Regular undergraduate students will become subject to probation or subject to disqualification for further registration in the University if they fail to make normal progress toward the baccalaureate.

- (A) Normal progress for all regular undergraduate students is defined in the following table, in terms of quarter units completed at the end of quarters enrolled.

Quarter	Normal Progress	Subject to Probation	Subject to Disqualification
1	12-15	8-11	7
2	24-30	16-23	15
3	36-45	24-35	23
4	50-60	40-49	39
5	65-75	56-64	55
6	80-90	72-79	71
7	96-105	89-95	88
8	112-120	106-111	105
9	128-135	124-127	123
10	145-150	142-144	141
11	162-165	160-161	159
12	180	-	-

- (B) Students who at the end of a given quarter of enrollment have completed no more than a number of units in the range specified in the “Normal Progress” category under (A) are making normal progress. Students who at the end of a given quarter of enrollment have completed a number of units in the range specified in the “Subject to Probation” category under (A) are subject to being placed on probation by the Faculty of that student's school or college or its designated agent. Students who at the end of a given quarter of enrollment have completed no more than a number of units in the range specified in the “Subject to Disqualification” category under (A) are subject to disqualification by the Faculty of that student's school or college or its designated agent.
- (C) Students who have completed two consecutive quarters on academic probation without having achieved at the end of that period at least the normal rate of progress specified under (A) are subject to disqualification.
- (D) For purposes of calculating “Normal Progress,” “Subject to Probation,” and “Subject to Disqualification,” students admitted to the University with

— 9 —

Advanced Standing will be classified with respect to quarter of enrollment at entrance in accordance with the following table.

Quarter at Entrance	Advanced Standing Quarter Units at Entrance
1	0-14
2	15-29
3	30-44
4	45-59
5	60-74

Quarter at Entrance	Advanced Standing Quarter Units at Entrance
6	75-89
7	90-104
8	105-119
9	120-134
10	135-149

- (E) Units earned under the following three circumstances are not to be counted toward determination of the quarter at entrance under (D) above: (1) Advanced Placement Examination; (2) College Level Examination; (3) concurrent enrollment in college courses while in high school.
- (F) The quarter of enrollment at entrance of students (including baccalaureate degree candidates who already hold a baccalaureate degree) seeking admission to the University with 150 or more Advanced Standing units will be determined by the Faculty offering the curriculum in which such a student seeks to enroll. This determination will be made consistent with the program required for such students to obtain the desired degree and with University residence requirements (SR 612 and 630).

The Council recommends that the Assembly ratify the Council's action by granting its approval to the above amendment.

Respectfully submitted

G. O. ABELL

H. H. ASCHMANN

J. F. BUNNETT

J. L. HODGES

R. E. HUNGATE

M. D. JONES

H. H. KAY

A. A. MARADUDIN

H. W. MENARD

K. S. PISTER

F. REINES

J. L. WALTERS

A. F. KIP, Vice Chairman

S. E. SPERLING, Chairman

The legislation contained in Part B of the Report of the Academic Council, 1972-73, was reviewed by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and has been found to be consistent with the *Manual of the Academic Senate*.

Respectfully submitted

D. S. HOBBS, *Chairman*

October 15, 1973

Report of the Committee on Budget and Interdivisional Relations, 1972-73

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The principal function of the Committee on Budget and Interdivisional Relations is to advise the President on academic personnel policy. This was done in 1972-73 by meeting with Vice President Taylor on November 9 and February 8, and by correspondence throughout the year. The views of the Committee were also regularly reported to the Academic Council. Much of our time was spent on revision of the Academic Personnel Manual, especially Section 52. We advised that (1) "appropriate consultation" by department chairmen with their colleagues on personnel cases means consultation consistent with Senate By-Law 188; (2) the current difficulties in the academic marketplace should not lead to a relaxation of our traditional high standards for tenure promotions and appointments; (3) a department should be able to recommend the nonreappointment of an assistant professor without fearing a reduction in staff size; (4) a Chancellor should not be permitted to delegate the decision not to reappoint an assistant professor; (5) a Chancellor should, on written request, provide an assistant professor with a written statement of reasons for nonreappointment; (6) it is wrong to release an assistant professor in order to appoint a less expensive replacement (and Divisional Budget Committees should be able to assure their colleagues that no such releases occur); (7) staff reduction for programmatic reasons is appropriate only after consultation with agencies of the Senate; (8) effective operation of our faculty review procedure depends on its confidentiality (and Divisional Budget Committees have the responsibility to see that confidentiality is not abused); (9) any staff reductions that are necessary in the agricultural sciences should be governed by the same principles that apply in other areas; (10) computing services on each campus need to be better integrated with other parts of the academic program; and (11) there should be no substantial increase in the number of University Professors, and any additional appointments to this title would require reform of the selection and review procedures.

Respectfully submitted

J.L. HODGES, JR., *Chairman*

September 14, 1973

Report of the Editorial Committee of the Academic Senate, 1972-1973

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

This report, our first in two years, deals with the work of the Editorial Committee and with the present state of the University of California Press.

In spite of deteriorating budgets, the publication program continues at full strength; books and monographs based on faculty research, distinguished books from outside sources, journals edited on our campuses—all are issued in numbers rather greater than in the past. The quality, also, appears to be improving.

— 11 —

While the Press has accepted sharp cuts in the operating subsidy (which will go to zero on 1 July 1974) the Scientific Publications Account, the fund controlled by the Committee, has suffered lesser reductions. With cheaper methods of composition, by typewriter and by computer, we are still able to support those publications that cannot pay for themselves by sales; no manuscript of general scholarly importance and of first quality has been declined. For the Press, the loss in operating subsidy has been balanced by increasing sales or offset by a tighter control of expenses. Committee and Press are not without problems, but the problems are being handled, and we are optimistic about the future of scholarly publishing in the University.

The dockets placed before the Committee are larger than ever. Each month 25 or 30 or more manuscripts are examined and the larger number are approved for publication. The Committee's work load is great and is increasing; but we take satisfaction in the results of our work.

The improving quality of the book program is attested by increasing sales, by the distinguished outside authors on the list, and by the prizes that are coming our way. These include in 1972-73 the Christian Gauss Award of Phi Beta Kappa to *The Pound Era* by Hugh Kenner, a book that was also given a silver medal by the Commonwealth Club. Four of our books were nominated for National Book Awards: *Mao's Way* by Edward Rice; *Self-Consuming Artifacts* by Stanley Fish; *Cancer; The Wayward Cell* by Victor Richards; and *The Aeneid of Virgil* by Allen Mandelbaum. In the final judgment, the latter book was given an award as the best translation of the year. Opinions differ: At almost the same time *The Poems of Sextus Propertius* by J. P. McCulloch received the P.E.N. Prize for the best translation. *Mao's Way* also received a gold medal from the Commonwealth Club. Elizabeth Whitcombe's *Agrarian Conditions in Northern India* took the Watumull Prize in Indian history. Tom Stoddard's *Pops Foster* won the ASCAP-Deems Taylor Award. Robert Zaller's *The Parliament of 1621* received a Phi Beta Kappa Book Award. Eleanor Long's *The Maid and the Hangman* was given the University of Chicago Folklore Prize. S. D. Goitein's *Mediterranean Society*, volumes 1 and 2, was awarded the Hawkins Medal of the Medieval Academy of America.

An individual prize may derive from the accidents of taste and judgment. We like to think that so many awards are a result, in part at least, of good manuscript selection. Of the prize winning authors, Kenner and Fish are members of the faculty; Long and Zaller are former students; Richards is a San Francisco physician and Clinical Professor of Surgery in the School of Medicine; Rice is a research associate; Mandelbaum, McCulloch, and Goitein teach elsewhere; Whitcombe and Stoddard are non-academics.

The list is not complete. And some of our most distinguished projects, for one reason or another, are not in line for prizes: The new and complete edition of the *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, edited by Robert Latham and William Matthews (7 volumes in print); *The Mark Twain Papers* (hitherto unpublished works, 7 volumes to date); the Iowa-California Edition of the *Works of Mark Twain* (two volumes in print, others in process); the California Edition of *The Works of John Dryden* (six volumes in print); the Sather Classical Lectures; and others.

* * *

Two years ago we discussed the reconstruction of the periodicals program. This

— 12 —

year we should like to report on the continuing examination and indeed on the reconstruction of the University monograph series. The Series, once the chief editorial strength of the Press, have declined over the past generation in relation to the book program. Although this decline is entirely normal in our view, resulting from a change in research emphasis here and elsewhere and also from the greater prestige of book publication in the humanities and especially in the social sciences, monograph series are still valuable in a number of disciplines; the Committee has worked long and hard to improve the quality of the remaining series and to develop more rigorous and more efficient methods of screening manuscripts.

A number of little used series have been discontinued. Others have been examined critically in conjunction with scholars in the disciplines concerned and with members of the Press staff. Means have been found to eliminate unnecessary material in some kinds of papers and to reduce their length. Efforts are being made to improve the quality of those series that have included work that is less than excellent. In particular, we have found that the method of screening by panels of readers inside the University is both slow and uncertain. One or two series have been given formal boards of editors, who are made responsible for recommending manuscripts to the Committee. But most series manuscripts have been made subject to the same kind of outside critical scrutiny that is given to book manuscripts—a method that is almost universal among university presses, including our own, in the handling of book manuscripts.

It has proved desirable in several fields—Slavic studies, classical studies, medieval and renaissance studies—to institute the publication of annual volumes, edited by faculty members and containing papers of shorter length, those that cannot be published efficiently as separate monographs.

Since series monographs are distributed primarily by library exchange and return very little of their cost from sales, they are a greater drain on our funds, page for page, than are the books. For this and other reasons it becomes more and more difficult to finance the longer works, whether these be taxonomical biology, editions of obscure literary works, or other lengthy descriptive studies. As funds decline and as printing costs move upward in all parts of the world, it becomes necessary to make use of the cheaper methods of composition if such works are not to be ruled out entirely. Typewriter composition has been improved much in recent years and is being made use of. On occasion authors or departments have been asked to provide copy ready for the camera and for offset printing. We are pleased to note that the Press is conducting experiments with computer composition—keyboarding on tape and keyboarding for the scanner. A few years from now it seems likely that our old dependence on standard type setting will be pretty much a thing of the past.

* * *

The present is a difficult time for university presses as it is for universities. A number of presses are closing their doors, several others are on notice, so to speak. Even Harvard came close to disaster and has undergone a forced reorganization. By a combination of good fortune and hard work, our own Press has come through in rather better shape than most and appears presently to be in sound financial condition. The decision of a few years ago to stress the search for excellent book manuscripts and to spend less on editorial handling—including the detailed assistance once given to authors—seems to be paying off not only in the quality of the list, as noted above,

— 13 —

but also in increasing sales. The sales volume dipped slightly in 1970-71, a year of disaster in some quarters, and then moved up by 14% in 1971-72 and again by more than 20% in the fiscal year just concluded. Although much of the increase has gone into the inflation of expenses, the Press has actually been able to improve its condition. We are still passing through difficult times—indeed such may be our normal lot from now on—and we expect that further adjustments to a harsh reality may be called for, but for the present we feel fortunate in holding our own.

* * *

Two members of the Editorial Committee, the northern and southern chairmen, are members of the Board of Control, the body that supervises the financial and administrative affairs of the Press. The Board has functioned smoothly and well during the past two years. The administrative members—Vice Presidents Taylor and Perkins and Assistant Vice President Furtado—have demonstrated an interest in the academic and intellectual values of the publishing program as well as their concern for its financial well being.

Respectfully submitted

D. A. ANTIN

J. P. BARRICELLI

B. M. BERGER

G. BERNS

R. N. BURR

E. C. CARTERETTE

D. J. CROWLEY

A. FRUGE (*Secretary*)

J. D. HUBERT

R. H. KELLOGG

R. D. LEHAN
R. A. LEWIN
R. ORNDUFF
J. REMAK
B. N. WARD
C. A. JOHNSON, *Chairman, North*
H. KENNER, *Chairman, South*
August 1, 1973

Report of the Committee on Educational Policy, 1972-73

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During 1972-73 the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) held seven full-day meetings. The principal activity centered on reviewing and recommending on diverse items referred to the Committee by Divisions, the Academic Council and the Office of the President. In its operation the Committee reported regularly to the Academic Council and maintained contact with Divisional CEP activities through exchange of minutes as well as by direct representation. In addition Vice President A. E. Taylor regularly attended meetings as a guest, providing up-to-date consultation on matters of mutual interest.

Before giving a brief enumerative summary of the major business of the Committee it may be informative to indicate certain areas of concern facing the Academic Senate which the Committee believes important:

- (1) The first of these is the matter of resource allocation. Faced with the continuing prospect of fiscal stringency in the University it is apparent that growth in new areas of teaching and research demands reduction or elimination in established areas.

— 14 —

In what Administration-Senate framework this is to be considered, and by what criteria such decisions are to be made are matters of utmost importance to the Senate, which must continue to be involved in long range academic review and planning for the optimal development of the multi-campus university system as a whole.

- (2) A related matter is the development of Pilot Programs in the Extended University. Because of the unique manner in which the Extended University was conceived and is evolving, particularly insofar as provisions for planning, resource allocation and Senate participation are concerned, procedural matters in the initial phases are particularly important. The UCEP carefully reviewed all Divisional proposals requiring variances to Senate Regulations. On the basis of this year's experience UCEP observes that Divisions should exercise more care to ensure that Pilot Program Proposals receive adequate review from appropriate Divisional committees.
- (3) Finally, the quality and content of the existing and various proposed Freshman Admissions schemes received considerable attention. While the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools has the primary responsibility for recommending on admissions questions, the UCEP wishes to reiterate that admissions criteria, however defined or applied, must reflect an adequate level of preparation for university-level work. With this reservation the UCEP endorses experimentation in defining the pool of students eligible for admission.

Summary of Committee Business

1. *Concurrent Enrollment* —Acting on a proposal of the University Committee on Extension, UCEP recommended to the Academic Council that Senate Regulations be modified so that students could receive both grade-point as well as unit credit for courses taken under “concurrent enrollment” if later the student were admitted to a degree program. The recommendation, however, was made with the

strong request that a basic reconsideration of the concurrent enrollment question should take place in the context of Extended University planning.

2. *Minimum Class Size* At the request of the Chairman of the Academic Council, UCEP reviewed the policy statement on minimum class size issued by the Office of the President during 1971-72. UCEP's recommendations for changes in the policy were endorsed by the Council and accepted by the Office of the President.
3. *Review of APPRB Task Force Reports* In the area of Academic planning UCEP either directly, or by appointment of University-wide sub-committees, reviewed and commented on a number of documents prepared by special committees of the APPRB. These included (a) Library Plans and Priorities (b) Educational Aspects of Computers (c) Instruction and Research in Agricultural Sciences (d) Review of "Planning for the Health Sciences, 1970-80."

In general these reviews by sub-committees were both enormously time-consuming as well as of high quality. In view of the relatively large response time required for Senate reply to Administratively prepared plans, it is recommended that more attention be given to fostering earlier and continuous consultation between appropriate Administrative and Senate officers to minimize lost time and effort.

4. *Divisional Grading Codes* Proposals for revised grading codes were submitted

— 15 —

by the Berkeley, Irvine and Riverside Divisions for UCEP review. These proposals, after some discussion and revision, were recommended to the Assembly at the June, 1973 meeting. At the present time the Davis and San Diego Divisions are delinquent in submitting proposals for revised grading codes.

5. *Grading Practice* —A brief summary (by campus) of grading trends in the last decade was prepared for information (see Tables 1 and 2). It may be observed that in general the fraction of A grades is increasing; the fraction of B grades shows no clear trend; and the fractions for C, D, and F grades are declining. Table 2 indicates the prevalence of P/NP grades (virtually non-existent ten years ago), along with failure rates for P/NP grading as compared to failure rates for A to F grading.
6. *Master Plan Reports* —UCEP also reviewed the reports of the Select Committee of the CCHE and the Joint Legislative Committee, both of which were concerned with the organization of higher education in the State. Responses were prepared for the Chairman of the Academic Council in connection with presentations at Committee hearings.

Respectfully submitted

L. Z. BENET (SF)

W. R. COMSTOCK (SB)

J. CONLISK (SD)

C. A. DEKKER (B) (W-Sp 1973)

J. DIZIKES (SC)

R. B. MARCH (R)

P. M. SCHACHTER (LA), Vice Chairman

S. E. SPERLING (R), Ex Officio

J. P. TUPIN (D)

N. M. WEINBERGER (I)

K. S. PISTER (B), Chairman

September 13, 1973

— 16 —

Table 1. CAMPUS GPAs																	
	Berkeley (fall qtr)		Davis (spr qtr)		Irvine (three qtrs)		Los Angeles (three qtrs)		Riverside (spr qtr)		San Diego (fall qtr)		Santa Barbara (three qtrs)		Santa Cruz (fall qtr) -fractions-		
	LD	UD	LD	UD	LD	UD	LD	UD	LD	UD	LD	UD	LD	UD	Pass	Fail	I or NR
61-62	2.42	2.75															
62-63																	
63-64	2.44	2.75	2.59	2.88			2.48	2.72	2.43 ₂	2.80 ₃							
64-65							2.58	2.85									
65-66	2.58	2.87	2.52	2.85	2.50	2.79	2.53	2.81			2.59	2.97			.877	.095	.028
66-67			2.64	2.90	2.49	2.69	2.58	2.81			2.51	2.61			.889	.079	.032
67-68	2.72	2.99			2.53	2.74	2.64 ₄	2.87 ₅			2.56	2.65	2.32	2.49	.910	.040	.050
68-69			2.70	3.00	2.66	2.81	2.71	2.93	2.71	2.95	2.62	2.72	2.45	2.57	.908	.030	.061
69-70	2.81	3.05	2.94	3.09	2.85	2.92	2.73	2.93	2.86	3.02	2.72	2.82	2.61	2.76	.902	.027	.071
70-71	2.89	3.03			2.78	2.96	2.71	2.90	2.81	2.97	2.88	2.76	2.76	2.89	.901	.018	.081
71-72			2.88	3.09	2.87	3.24	2.73	2.92	2.87	2.92	2.78	2.90	2.82	2.96	.894	.016	.090
72-73											2.91	2.94	2.83 ₆	2.99 ₇	.931	.000	.067

— 17 —

Table 2. RECENT P/NP FRACTIONS								
	Lower Division				Upper Division			
	(P + NP) / All	NP / (P + NP)	(D + F) / A to F	F / A to F	(P + NP) / All	NP / (P + NP)	(D + F) / A to F	F / A to F
UCB Sp 71	.26	.061	.067	.031	.17	.038	.039	.017
UCD Sp 72	.13	.006	.054	.021	.11	.005	.035	.014
UCI Sp 72	.26	.020	.058	.017	.08	.013	.021	.006
UCLA Sp 72	.09	.060	.083	.041	.06	.043	.047	.020
UCR Sp 72	.15	.041	.053	.023	.06	.031	.038	.017

- 2. a Fall quarter
- 3. a Fall quarter
- 4. b Winter quarter missing
- 5. b Winter quarter missing
- 6. a Fall quarter
- 7. a Fall quarter

Table 2. RECENT P/NP FRACTIONS								
	Lower Division				Upper Division			
	(P + NP) / All	NP / (P + NP)	(D + F) / A to F	F / A to F	(P + NP) / All	NP / (P + NP)	(D + F) / A to F	F / A to F
UCSD Wr 72	.16	.038	.084	.044	.07	.059	.080	.048
UCSB					.09	.100	.048	.014

Code: All = (total number of A to F or P/NP grades)

A to F = (total number of A to F grades)

P = (number of P grades)

F = (number of F grades)

Etc.

Report of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs 1972-73

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

I. New Degrees and Programs

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs reviewed 27 proposals for new degrees and programs submitted by the Divisional Graduate Councils and made recommendations concerning the initiation of these new programs. The following is a summary of action taken by CCGA.

NEW DEGREES					
Degree	Field	Date Received	Action:	Date	Notification to President
<i>Los Angeles</i>					
D.Env. (Doctor of Environmental Science and Engineering)	Environmental Science and Engineering	10-72	<i>Approved</i>	2-5-73	2-8-73
Ph.D.	Buddhist Studies	6-72	Approved	10-10-72	10-16-72
M.S.	Health and Medical Sciences	11-72	Approved	4-9-73	5-11-73
J.D., M.A.	Law and Economics (Concurrent)	3-73	Approved	5-8-73	5-11-73
M.A., Ph.D.	Neurobiology	4-73	Approved	5-8-73	5-11-73
M.A.T.	French and Education	5-73	Approved	8-73	8-31-73
M.A.	Biophysics	5-73	Approved	6-4-73	8-31-73

NEW DEGREES					
Degree	Field	Date Received	Action:	Date	Notification to President
<i>Los Angeles</i>					
Certificate of Completion	Bibliography; Library Automation and Information Service; and Library Management	10-72	Approved	12-12-72	12-18-72
M.A.	Mathematics	4-73	Approved	5-8-73	5-11-73
M.S., Ph.D.	Computing Science	5-73	Deferred	6-4-73	..
M.S.	Dietetics	4-73	Deferred	6-4-73	..
M.A., Ph.D.	Social Ecology	2-73	Deferred		
M.A.	Social Ecology (resubmitted)	5-73	Approved	6-4-73	6-11-73
M.A.T.	Spanish	5-73	Approved	7-73	8-6-73
M.F.A.	Music (Performance Practices)	10-72	Approved	12-12-72	1-18-73
Ph.D.	Theater Arts (formerly Theater History)	10-72	Approved	3-13-73	3-30-73
M.S., Ph.D.	Biomathematics	1-73	Approved	3-13-73	3-30-73
Ph.D.	Individual Program of Graduate Studies	5-73	Approved	6-4-73	6-11-73
M.A.	Theatre	11-72	Approved	3-13-73	3-30-73
M.S.	Applied Science	3-73	Approved	5-8-73	5-11-73
Ph.D.	Experimental Pathology	9-72	Approved	11-7-72	11-15-72
Ph.D.	Individual Interdisciplinary Program in Comparative Studies in Language, Society and Culture	2-73	Approved	3-13-73	3-30-73
M.A.	Dramatic Art	6-72	Approved	10-10-72	10-16-72
M.A., Ph.D.	Individual Interdisciplinary Programs	6-72	Approved	10-10-72	10-16-72
M.A.	Public and Social Affairs	11-72	Approved	3-13-73	3-30-73
M.S.	Nuclear Engineering	3-73	Approved	4-9-73	4-12-73
M.A., Ph.D.	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	5-73	Approved	6-4-73	6-11-73
Certificate	Translating and Interpreting in German	5-73	Approved	6-4-73	6-11-73

II. Changes in Degree Programs

The CCGA also reviewed and forwarded the following changes in existing degree programs:

Degree	Field	Date	Notification to President
A. Extension of fields of study:			
Ph.D.	History (to include European Socio-economic History, Psycho-history, and African History)	10-10-72	10-16-72
Ph.D.	History (to include European Culture and Intellectual History; and History of Southeast Europe)	12-12-72	12-18-72
M.B.A.	Business Management (to include Management in Education)	6-4-73	6-11-73
Ph.D.	Music Education (to include Ethnomusicology)	3-13-73	3-30-73
M.A.	French (additional option)	3-13-73	3-30-73
M.Ed.	Education (to include Teaching of Reading)	4-9-73	4-12-73
M.A.	History (to include a Western American field)	3-13-73	3-30-73
Ph.D.	Psychology (to include Developmental Psychology)	12-12-72	12-18-72
M.A.	Educational Psychology (to include Early Childhood Education)	5-8-73	5-11-73
M.F.A.	Modification of requirements	6-4-73	6-11-73
B. Change in designation:			
M.S., M.A.	Geology (designation of degrees)	4-9-73	4-12-73
M.A., Ph.D.	Near Eastern Studies, formerly Near Eastern Languages	4-9-73	4-12-73
Certificate	Elementary Teacher Education	3-13-73	3-30-73
M.S., Ph.D.	Pharmacology and Toxicology, formerly Comparative Pharmacology and Toxicology	5-8-73	5-11-73
M.S.	Kinesiology, formerly Physical Education	3-13-73	3-30-73
M.S., Ph.D.	Microbiology and Immunology, formerly Medical Microbiology and Immunology	5-8-73	5-11-73
M.A., Ph.D.	Germanic Languages and Literatures, formerly German	11-7-72	11-15-72
M.A., Ph.D.	Sanskrit, in the Department of Near Eastern Studies	4-9-73	4-12-73
M.S.	Information Science (Documentation), in the School of Library Science	3-13-73	3-30-73

Respectfully submitted
F. REINES, *Chairman*
October 9, 1973

Amendment to the Santa Barbara Division Grading System

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Senate Regulation 778, enacted November 17, 1970, provides in paragraph (B) that:

778(B) The grading system to be used by a Division and modification thereof must be reviewed by the University Committee on Educational Policy and be certified for consonance with the Code of the Academic Senate [see By-Law 144] by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction. These Committees report their findings to the Senate Assembly for information. Thereafter the proposed grading system becomes effective as provided by Divisional action unless the Assembly determines otherwise.

Accordingly, the Secretary submits for the information of the Assembly the recommendations of the Committees on Educational Policy and Rules and Jurisdiction concerning the proposed amendment to the grading system of the Santa Barbara Division.

Respectfully submitted

R. A. COCKRELL, Secretary (North)

October 2, 1973

RECOMMENDATIONS: *University Committee on Educational Policy:* The proposed amendment to the Santa Barbara Division grading code contained in A20 (D) (1), as approved by the Faculty legislature on May 10, 1973, was reviewed and approved by UCEP at its meeting on June 18, 1973.

For the Committee

K. S. PISTER, Chairman, 1972-73

University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction: The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has reviewed the amendment to the Santa Barbara grading system approved by the Santa Barbara Faculty Legislature on May 10, 1973 and finds it consistent with the *Manual of the Academic Senate*.

For the Committee

D. S. HOBBS, Chairman

Amendment to the Santa Barbara Grading System

The following amendment to Divisional Regulation A20(D) (1) was approved by the Faculty Legislature on May 10, 1973.

Present Wording	Amended Wording Recommended
A20. (Section 2. Grades and Credit) (D) (1) The grade <i>Incomplete</i> (I) may be assigned when a student's work is of passing quality, but is incomplete. The student is entitled to have the grade of <i>Incomplete</i> replaced by a passing grade, as determined by the instructor concerned, and to receive unit credit and appropriate grade points upon satisfactory completion of the work of the course by the end of the next full quarter of the student's registration in regular session. If the instructor is unavailable, the chairman of the department in which the course was offered is authorized to supervise the completion of the work and to make the appropriate grade change. The dean of the appropriate college or school has authority to extend the deadline for completion in the event of unusual circumstances that would clearly impose an unfair hardship on the student if the original deadline were maintained. If the work is not completed according to the deadline or authorized extension of it, the <i>Incomplete</i> shall automatically be changed to an F or NP as appropriate.	(D) (1) The grade <i>Incomplete</i> (I). . . registration in a regular session in which the course is offered, or by the end of one calendar year from the date of receipt of the grade, which ever date occurs first. If the instructor..

COMMENT:

The change proposed will permit an I grade to be completed, without petition, the next time the course in question is offered, provided that the date be not later than one year from the time the original course was taken. This extension of the deadline, and the encouragement to the student to take the regular, though later, examination, should very much facilitate matters for administration, professors, and students.

October 2, 1973

Report of the Academic Council

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

I. By-Law 100(A). Committee on Education Abroad Program

At its meeting on April 27, 1973, the University Committee on Committees recommended that By-Law 100(A) be amended. This recommendation has been approved by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and by the Academic Council at its September 19, 1973, meeting.

The reason for the amendment is as follows: the odd number of members (9) makes it impossible for all members to have two-year terms [By-Law 7(A)] and to follow the dictates of the last sentence of 100(A). The proposed change removes this difficulty by modifying slightly the last sentence in 100(A).

— 22 —

Present Wording	Amended Wording Recommended
100. <i>Education Abroad Program</i>	100... .
(A) <i>Membership. . . .</i> The selection of members should adhere to the principle of rotation between Senate and administrative representatives, so that no campus is represented either by a Senate or by an administrative appointee for more than two consecutive years.	The selection of members should adhere to the principle of rotation of members, with no campus being represented by an administrative appointee for more than two consecutive years.

The President would then annually appoint two administrators for two-year terms according to the schedule arranged to provide for rotation of appointments among the campuses.

II. Standing Order of The Regents 105.2(c)

Some time ago the Regents' Standing Order 105.1 was amended to include in the Academic Senate membership the In-Residence Series and Lecturers and Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment. Probably through inadvertence, these titles were not at the same time added in 105.2(c) to the classes of employees having the right to vote in department meetings.

On the basis of recommendations by last year's Academic Council Special Committee on Reorganization and by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, the Council recommends that the Assembly approve a request that SOR 105.2(c) be amended.

The amendment, as originally recommended by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, would eliminate the listing in 105.2(c) of classes of appointments having the right to vote in department meetings and, instead, state that all members of the Academic Senate by virtue of their academic titles shall have the right to vote in department meetings, thus tying SOR 105.2 to the listing of SOR 105.1.

The Academic Council therefore recommends that the Assembly request the following changes be made in SOR 105.2(c):

Present Wording	Amended Wording Recommended
<p>105.2. <i>Duties, Powers, and Privileges of the Academic Senate.</i> . . .</p> <p>(c) The Academic Senate shall determine the membership of the several faculties and councils, subject to the provisions of Standing Order 105.1(c), except the faculties of Hastings College of the Law, and San Francisco Art Institute, provided that the several departments of the University, with the approval of the President, shall determine their own form of administrative organization, and all Professors, Associate Professors, Acting Professors, Acting Associate Professors and Assistant Professors, and all Instructors of at least two (2) years' service shall have the right to vote in department meetings.</p>	<p>105.2... ..</p> <p>. . . , and all department members who are voting members of the Academic Senate by virtue of their academic titles shall have the right to vote in department meetings.</p>

Respectfully submitted

A. F. KIP, *Chairman*

October 24, 1973

Report of the Committee on Committees

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Committee on Committees of the Academic Senate reports the following changes in Committee Appointments, 1973-74, for the information of the Assembly.

Academic Council: Chairmen of Divisions: B. Rosenblum (Fall) and G. Cooper (Winter & Spring) (SC).

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools: E. M. Eigner (R) appointed in place of T. L. Broadbent (R), resigned.

Budget and Interdivisional Relations: E. L. Winterer (SD) appointed in place of M. E. Friedkin (SD), unable to serve.

Education Abroad Program: Senate Appointees: G. H. Gossen (SC) 1974⁸. Appointed by the President:

8. Terms of office end August 31 of the year indicated

H. Baerwald (LA) (2 years), G. P. Georghious (R) (1 year), S. D. Krebs (SB) (2 years), J. H. Martin (I) (1 year).

Educational Policy: R. S. Sawyer (SB) appointed in place of R. W. Reynolds (SB), unable to serve.

Privilege and Tenure: E. Bodenheimer (D) 1975⁹, appointed.

University Extension: H. M. Richmond (B) appointed in place of R. S. Muller (B), unable to serve; D. Orr (SD) and J. S. Margon (SB), appointed.

Respectfully submitted

G. E. BAKER (SB)

R. J. BERGER (SC)

L. H. COHEN (R)

N. W. GILBERT (D)

¹⁰ R. N. HAMBURGER (SD)

A. C. HELMHOLZ (B)

A. F. KIP (B), *Ex officio*

N. M. KROLL (SD)

B. R. NEVIUS (LA)

M. E. NEWTON (SF)

R. L. REGOSIN (I)

¹¹ M. E. MATHIAS (LA), *Chairman*

October 24, 1973

* Terms of office end August 31 of the year indicated.

+ Members-at-large

— 24 —

Report of the Davis Division

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate, at its meeting of October 15, 1973, passed the following proposals of the College of Letters and Science (Davis):

I

A _____. A regular student in good standing registered in the College of Letters and Science may take courses on a *Passed* or *Not Passed* basis. The grade of *Passed* shall be awarded for work which would otherwise receive a grade of "C-" or better. Units thus earned shall be counted in satisfaction of degree requirements, but shall be disregarded in determining the student's grade-point average. In the event that a student does not pass a course under this option, no entry shall be made on his transcript. Not less than three-fourths of the units taken in residence at the Davis campus and presented for graduation must be in courses taken for a letter grade excepting those courses taken in accordance with Davis Division Regulation A547.

The College of Letters and Science (Davis) has requested this variance to SR 782 because the present regulation reads "one course per quarter on the average" and the bookkeeping system makes this an

9. Terms of office end August 31 of the year indicated

10. *Members-at-large*

11. *Members-at-large*

unenforceable regulation. It is intended that, if passed by the Assembly, this variance will be made effective for the Winter Quarter, 1974.

II

- A _____. A full-time regular undergraduate student (see Davis Regulation C560 for definition of part-time degree-students), in the College of Letters and Science who does not pass at least 36 units during his/her first three terms of enrollment on the Davis Campus shall be placed on probation. A full-time regular undergraduate student in the College of Letters and Science who does not pass at least 30 units during his/her first three terms of enrollment on the Davis Campus shall be subject to disqualification.
- (a) After three terms of enrollment at Davis, a full-time regular undergraduate student in the College of Letters and Science who does not pass at least 12 units in any term, or at least 40 units during any three consecutive terms, shall be placed (or remain) on probation. If such a student does not pass at least 34 units during any three consecutive terms, he/she shall be subject to disqualification.
 - (b) A full-time regular undergraduate student in the College of Letters and Science shall be subject to disqualification after two consecutive terms on probation.
 - (c)

The College of Letters and Science (Davis) has requested this variance to SR 900 to provide a series of minimal progress regulations. It is intended that, if passed by the Assembly, this variance will be made effective for the Winter Quarter, 1974.

Respectfully submitted
R. D. CRAMER, *Chairman*
October 16, 1973

— 25 —

Report of the Irvine Division

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Irvine Division of the Academic Senate, in its meeting of October 11, 1973, voted to request of the Assembly at its meeting of November 28, 1973, a variance from Senate Regulation 764. The rationale for the request for a two-year variance follows.

By custom and by sound educational practice, UC Irvine has attempted to make the pursuit of Independent Study projects possible for students on this campus. This is in accord with Senate Regulation 764: "Credit in special study courses for undergraduates is limited to five units per term." Individual Study projects, however, may on occasion be designed which would allow the UC Irvine student a more intensive experience in independent work; under certain conditions, it may, for instance, be desirable for a student to devote all classes in a single quarter to an independent project. The work of students in the Student Lobby offers an example of one such circumstance, which Senate Regulation 764 would not allow.

The following statement on the Student Lobby and its activities was submitted to the Irvine Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) by the ASUCI representative of the Student Lobby and is included for the information of the Assembly.

In early February 1971, the Associated Students of the University of California embarked on the formation of a Student Lobby in Sacramento. Students from a variety of disciplines will be involved as interns in the Associated Students of the University of California Lobby office in Sacramento during all academic quarters

and the summer session. The function of the ASUC Lobby office in Sacramento is two-fold, involving both the compilation of current information on the function and structure of State government as well as advocacy. Separate from, but equally important to their lobbying activity, is the learning experience intrinsic to the internship in which the interns are doing extensive research utilizing legislative reference materials.

The research function will take approximately two-thirds of the intern's time and will merit twelve units of credit. Participating students will talk with legislators and agency heads, meet with staff members, read state and local government reports, and, at the end of the ten-week quarter, compile a thorough academic report on the subject of their research choice.

The remaining one-third of the intern's time will be spent trying to break down the stereotypes through which students are viewed by legislators. Because of its political nature, this activity will **not** be the subject of academic credit. Time will be spent securing support for legislation initiated or opposed by the UC students, meeting extensively with a number of legislators on campus problems, observing and testifying before legislative committees, and preparing position statements.

There is strong evidence in support of the academic integrity of the Lobby program. Unfortunately, the current systems of 198 and 199 credit are not adequate to meet the needs of students interested in participating in this program. For example, on the UCI campus, while the Political Science Department or the School of Social Science seems the logical source of academic support and supervision for the student

— 26 —

interns, because some students are neither majors in the Department or the School, there is a reluctance to provide the necessary academic sponsorship. There is a similar reluctance for other departmental sponsorship because of the tangential nature of the academic content.

Participating male students who are subject to the draft require validation of normal academic progress, i.e., twelve academic credits each quarter, in order to maintain their student status. At the same time, **all** participating students male and female, wish to maintain normal academic progress while part of this learning experience for which they propose academic effort, research work, and/or seminar meetings, compatible with the integrity of the institution.

The Irvine CEP has consulted with UC Irvine officers of instruction and ASUCI and has concluded that to allow for the learning associated with work in the Student Lobby, a variance to Senate Regulation 764 should be requested, as follows:

A 390. Credit for special study courses for undergraduates is limited to five units per term. However, students may enroll in up to 12 units of special study courses (197, 198, 199) during one quarter in course work associated with Student Lobby projects. Those doing so may not enroll in any other special study course during the same academic year. This variance is granted for a period of two years; at the end of the first year an interim report on the operations of this variance will be submitted by the supervising instructors to the Irvine Division Committee on Educational Policy, with a full report at the end of the second year.

The Irvine CEP has established the following guidelines for the operation of this program:

1. There must be faculty supervision and at least four meetings per quarter between students and supervising faculty.
2. No more than eight students may participate in any one quarter.
3. To be eligible a student must have at least a 3.0 grade-point average.
4. Students enrolled in this program will not be eligible for enrollment in any other independent study course during the year.
5. There must be an academic product (papers, bibliographies, etc.) resulting from such work.
6. The students enrolled in this program should keep a calendar separating their academic time from their associated lobbying activities.

The Irvine CEP feels that these controls will help to make this program the best kind of educational experience and recommends the variance for Assembly approval.

The Irvine Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has reviewed the above proposal and finds it consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate, and the request for a variance has been submitted to the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction.

Respectfully submitted
K. MOLDAVE, *Chairman*
October 24, 1973

— 27 —

Report of the San Francisco Division

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Assembly of the Academic Senate, at its meeting on May 30, 1973, approved the grading regulations for candidates for the M.D. degree in the School of Medicine, effective September 1972. A proviso that the letter “Y” be replaced by some other symbol has been complied with, and the letter “E” now designates the “ *not passing* ” grade.

Subsequent to the meeting, and within the time limit set by Academic Senate By-Law 70, a petition was received from 25 members of the Academic Senate, requesting that the Assembly reconsider the approval retroactive to September 1972. Therefore, the effective date of the legislation was May 30, 1973.

The San Francisco Division now requests that the Assembly again consider the recommendation of the Faculty of the School of Medicine to approve the effective date of September 1972 for the regulation.

The corrected legislation appears as follows:

San Francisco Medical School Grading Regulation for Candidates for the M.D. Degree

— 28 —

- (A) The work of all professional students who are candidates for the M.D. degree shall be reported as follows:
- (1) *passing*: P (passed) (honors recognition—see paragraph (B) below);
 - (2) *not passing*: E (provisional—see paragraph (C) below), F (failure);
 - (3) undetermined: Incomplete, In Progress (see paragraph (D) and (E) below).
- (B) All course instructors will determine the criteria for honors recognition for all core and non-core courses of more than two units. Honors recognition is to be considered a citation based upon a separate written evaluation for the recognition of a student's outstanding performance. The student may choose to refuse the honors designation. Honors recognition will not be given in core or noncore courses of two units or less. This citation will be kept as a part of the student's record in the office of the School of Medicine but will not be included on the record card in the Registrar's Office.
- (C) The E grade is assigned as an initial non-passing provisional grade. It may be converted to a passing grade when the requirements for the course are satisfactorily met as determined by the course instructor. It will be converted to an F grade by the course instructor, after consultation with the Screening and Promotions Committee, if a student fails to complete satisfactorily the course requirements within a period of time to be determined by the Screening and Promotions Committee.
- (D) The grade I may be assigned when a student's work is of passing quality, but is incomplete for good

cause. The student may replace the Incomplete grade by a final grade and receive appropriate credit provided he completes the work of the course in a way authorized by the appropriate faculty. (See paragraph (E) below).

- (E) All grades except I, IP, and E are final when filed by an instructor in his end-of-term course report. However, the correction of clerical or procedural errors may be authorized by the appropriate faculty concerned. No term grade except I or E may be revised by examination. A student may repeat only those courses in which the student has received a grade of E. An exception to this rule may be authorized by the appropriate faculty for a student who receives the grade of I.
- (F) When a student is required by the Faculty or its designated agent to repeat a year, or a term, or specifically named courses, the units will be counted only once.
- (G) For courses extended over more than one quarter where evaluation of the student's performance is deferred until the end of the final quarter, undetermined grades of In Progress shall be assigned in the intervening quarters in courses so authorized by the appropriate faculty. The undetermined grades shall be replaced by the final grades if the student completes the full sequence. The Faculty of the School of Medicine is authorized to regulate the award of credit in cases where the full sequence is not completed.

APPROVED by the San Francisco Division, May 10, 1973; also APPROVED was a request by the Faculty of the School of Medicine for an effective date retroactive to September, 1972.

Respectfully submitted
M. D. JONES, *Chairman*
October 24, 1973